

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Claims 3 and 23 were amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-46 are pending in the application.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 31-32, and 34-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bailey et. Al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062258) herein after referred to as “Bailey”

Claims 7 and 30 were rejected as unpatentable over Bailey in view of Gavarini (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0184430) herein after referred to as “Gavarini”.

Claims 10 and 33 were rejected as unpatentable over Bailey in view of Scholl (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149390) herein after referred to as “Scholl”.

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 31-32, and 34-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bailey. Claim 1 contains features not taught by the cited prior art.

Bailey describes a system for parametrically searching a database of products belonging to various categories and generating product offerings based on that search. In contrast Claim 1 is directed to a method of associating a product offering with a product category and its corresponding product abstraction.

Bailey describes a product procurement system where the user is able to search for an item inside a product database based on certain characteristics of the item, without knowing specific query rules. Bailey’s product database contains tables which characterize the products such as the “keyword table”, “characteristic table” a “keyword_char” table etc. p6. p59. Thus

Bailey describes a system where items are already present inside the catalog, categorized and associated with their characteristics. Claim 1 on the other hand, teaches a feature fundamentally different, where a product, which is not associated with a category, is assigned to a category. Specifically, Claim 1 requires "based on the first data set, associating said particular product with a product category". None of these elements are shown or in any way suggested by Bailey.


Based on the foregoing, Bailey fails to teach at least one feature of independent Claim 1 and thus fails to teach all the features of Claim 1. The currently amended Claims 3 and 23, as well as dependent Claims 2-46, contain all the limitations of independent Claim 1. Because it was shown that independent claim contains features not taught by the cited prior art reference reconsideration and removal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP


Yury A. Perzov
Reg. No. 58,547

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 414-1080
Date: December 13, 2006
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on December 13, 2006

by 
Darci Sakamoto